

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 15-16, and 33-37 are pending, with claims 1, 15, 33, and 34 being independent. Claims 2-3, 6, 10-14, and 17-32 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 5, 15, 33, 34, and 37 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4-9, 15, 16, and 33-37 were rejected as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021649 ("Goodman") in view of United States Patent No. 5,933,811 ("Angles").

As to claim 1, Goodman and Angles, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that "determining the trust score for the advertiser comprises determining a first amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a first reason, determining a second amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a second reason, applying a first weighting factor to the first amount of advertisements to generate a first trust score component, applying a second weighting factor to the second amount of advertisements to generate a second trust score component, and generating the trust score based on the first trust score component and the second trust score component," as now recited in claim 1. Particularly, the office action cited paragraph 110 of Goodman as supporting the statement that "Goodman teaches [that] determining the trust score for the advertiser further uses reasons for which declined advertisements in the subset were declined." *See* the discussion of claim 6 on page 5 of the office action. However, paragraphs 109 and 110 of Goodman merely describe that, after a "sender has been flagged as a potential spammer" (*see* paragraph 109), "[h]uman inspection can verify, [sic] the content of the messages as well as determine reasons for the account to be sending suspicious messages." *See* paragraph 110. Thus, the cited portion of Goodman does not disclose that different reasons for declining different advertisements of a group of advertisements are used to generate a trust score for an advertiser. Rather, Goodman discloses that a human can interpret a sample of messages to determine a reason why messages flagged as potential spam are legitimate. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 5, 7-9, and 35-37 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, Goodman and Angles, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest determining the trust score for the advertiser, as discussed above, only after “determining that the advertiser was not previously determined to be a trusted advertiser,” and “submitting the advertisements in the set of advertisements for review using an automated review process” if the advertiser was previously determined to be a trusted advertiser, as recited in claim 1. With respect to these features, the office action cited paragraphs 99 and 110 of Goodman. However, as described above, paragraph 110 of Goodman describes a manual review process that is performed after messages are flagged as potential spam, and allows the score for the messages to be reset if the reviewer identifies a reason why the flagged messages are legitimate. Paragraph 99 of Goodman similarly describes steps that are taken after a sender has been determined to be a potential spammer. Thus, the cited portions of the references do not disclose an automated review process that is performed if an advertiser is determined to be a trusted advertiser. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 5, 7-9, and 35-37 should be withdrawn.

Though not identical, claims 15, 33, and 34 recite features similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. For example, claim 15 recites “determining a trust score using information concerning disapproved advertisements in the subset, approved advertisements in the subset, and reasons for any disapprovals,” and each of claims 33 and 34 recites “determining a first amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a first reason, determining a second amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a second reason, applying a first weighting factor to the first amount of advertisements to generate a first trust score component, applying a second weighting factor to the second amount of advertisements to generate a second trust score component, and generating the trust score based on the first trust score component and the second trust score component.” Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the rejections of claims 15 and its dependent claim 16, claim 33, and claim 34 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All pending claims are believe to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is requested. Should there be any questions regarding this

paper, or if an interview would assist in prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney.

Payment in the amount of \$130.00 for the requisite fee for a one-month extension of time is made with this filing on the electronic filing system by deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or any credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 17 May 2010

/George P. Bonanto/
George P. Bonanto
Reg. No. 59,717

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945